## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

BRADLEY SCOTT RITCHIE, et al.,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:19-cv-01480-JCM-NJK

## Order

[Docket No. 18]

Pending before the Court is Defendants' motion to stay discovery pending resolution of their motion to dismiss. Docket No. 18; *see also* Docket No. 7 (motion to dismiss). A response in limited opposition was filed. Docket No. 22.

The Court is unclear as to Plaintiffs' position. The governing standard provides that staying discovery is appropriate when, *inter alia*, "the potentially dispositive motion can be decided without discovery." *Kor Media Grp., LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581 (D. Nev. 2013). On the other hand, Plaintiffs' limited opposition does not oppose entry of a stay of discovery so long as they are allowed to "conduct[] discovery to overcome the [m]otion [to dismiss]." Docket No. 22 at 3.<sup>1</sup> The governing standard also provides that a stay of discovery is appropriate when it is clear that the dispositive motion will be granted. *Kor Media*, 294 F.R.D. at 581. On the other hand,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The limited opposition appears to exhibit some confusion as to the roles of the judges in this courthouse. The undersigned magistrate judge will be deciding the motion to stay discovery, but the assigned district judge will be deciding the motion to dismiss.

Plaintiffs' limited opposition does not oppose entry of a stay of discovery, unless the Court is inclined to grant the motion to dismiss. *See* Docket No. 22 at 3.<sup>2</sup>

In short, the positions advanced in Plaintiffs' limited opposition are at odds with the governing standards. The Court will provide Plaintiffs with an opportunity clarify whether they believe Defendants have met the standards governing motions to stay discovery. <u>Plaintiffs must</u> file an amended response by October 31, 2019.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 30, 2019

Nancy J. Koppe

United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The third element of the standard governing motions to stay discovery is that the underlying motion is potentially dispositive in scope and effect. *See Kor Media*, 294 F.R.D. at 581. There appears to be no dispute that the motion to dismiss is potentially dispositive in scope and effect.